



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/559,609	12/02/2005	Shinji Eritate	03500.103418.	1529
5514 7590 05/17/2010 FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 1290 Avenue of the Americas NEW YORK, NY 10104-3800				
EXAMINER				
EICHELMAYER, ALIX ELIZABETH				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1795				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/17/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/559,609

Applicant(s)

ERITATE ET AL.

Examiner

Alix Elizabeth Echelmeyer

Art Unit

1795

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3-5 and 7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-5 and 7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/22)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office Action is in response to the amendment filed March 15, 2010. Claim 3 is amended. Claims 3-5 and 7 are pending and are rejected for the reasons given below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama et al. (US 2002/0061431) in view of Tsusaka et al. (US 2002/0001744), and as evidenced by Kosako et al. (US 2003/0158273).

Koyama et al. teaches a fuel cell having solid polymer electrolyte membrane containing a sulfonic group (abstract). Koyama et al. teach that a fuel cell assembly is made by forming a catalyst layer, coating it with a layer of electrolyte solution, and then bonding the catalyst layer to the membrane [0061].

Koyama et al. fail to explicitly teach that the precursor layer infiltrates the catalyst layer.

Kosaka et al. teach that when there is direct application of a polymer electrolyte, as occurs in Koyama et al., there results infiltration of the electrolyte into the catalyst

layer ([0105]). Based on the teachings of Kosaka et al., the skilled artisan will recognize that, when a layer of electrolyte solution is coated on the catalyst layer, the electrolyte inherently infiltrates the catalyst layer.

Koyama et al. fail to teach that the composition is polymerized.

Tsusaka et al. teach a membrane electrode assembly (MEA) for a solid polymer fuel cell (abstract). Tsusaka et al. teach that the MEA comprises a polymer electrolyte membrane having catalyst layers on either side, wherein the membrane and catalyst layers include a compound having activity to an active energy ray, that infiltrates both the membrane and the catalyst layer (Figure 1; [0025]; [0028]; [0029]).

Tsusaka et al. teach that the MEA is made by bonding the catalyst layer, to the membrane by thermal bonding, or active energy ray ([0064]). The thermal bonding causes polymerization, bonding the layers together ([0067], [0076]-[0078]).

Tsusaka et al. further teach an electrode metal catalyst layer, wherein the catalyst layer is made of a metal, platinum or platinum alloy, supported on carbon ([0072]). This is the same electrode metal catalyst as found in the instant specification (page 9 lines 14-25).

Tsusaka et al. teach that polymerization of the components after assembly leads to better bonding between the catalyst layer and membrane, preventing possible bond failures which can lead to broken conductivity paths ([0022]).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to polymerize the electrolyte coating of Koyama et al. after application of the membrane in order to provide a better bond.

4. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama et al. in view of Tsusaka et al. as applied to claim 3 above, and in further view of Fuglevand et al. (US 6,218,035).

The teachings of Koyama et al. and Tsusaka et al. as discussed above are incorporated herein.

Koyama et al. in view of Tsusaka et al. teach a reinforcement member for the membrane ([0062]) but fail to teach that the reinforcement member is an electrical insulator.

The reinforcement member of Koyama et al. in view of Tsusaka et al. is part of the catalyst layer, so it is provided on the catalyst layer.

Koyama et al. in view of Tsusaka et al. further teach an electrode metal catalyst layer, wherein the catalyst layer is made of a metal, platinum or platinum alloy, supported on carbon ([0072]). This is the same electrode metal catalyst as found in the instant specification (page 9 lines 14-25).

Fuglevand et al. teach a support matrix, or reinforcement member, for use in their solid polymer proton exchange membrane fuel cell (column 19 lines 39-40). Grafted polyethylene is provided as an example of the reinforcement member (column 19 lines

59-61). The instant specification discloses ethylene as a suitable material for the reinforcement layer ([0063]).

It would be desirable to use a non-conductive reinforcement member, such as the one of Fuglevand et al., in the membrane of Koyama et al. in view of Tsusaka et al. since a non-conductive reinforcement member would provide support without interfering with the electronic operation of the fuel cell.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a non-conductive reinforcement member, such as the one of Fuglevand et al., in the membrane of Koyama et al. in view of Tsusaka et al. since a non-conductive reinforcement member would provide support without interfering with the electronic operation of the fuel cell.

5. Claims 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama et al. in view of Tsusaka et al. as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Akita et al. (US 6,523,699).

The teachings of Koyama et al. and Tsusaka et al. as discussed above are incorporated herein.

With regard to claim 4, Koyama et al. in view of Tsusaka et al. further teach an electrode metal catalyst layer, wherein the catalyst layer is made of a metal, platinum or platinum alloy, supported on carbon ([0072]). This is the same electrode metal catalyst as found in the instant specification (page 9 lines 14-25).

Koyama et al. in view of Tsusaka et al. fail to teach the thickness of the catalyst and electrode layers, only that the layers are desired to be thin ([0011]; [0027]).

Akita et al. teach a fuel cell having excellent catalytic activity (abstract).

Akita et al. further teach that the platinum catalyst should be 50-250 μm thick. According to Akita et al., for catalyst thicknesses less than 50 μm , there could be an insufficient amount of catalyst, and for thicknesses greater than 250 μm , the possibility of the catalyst surface becoming unstable arises (column 8 lines 31-44).

As for the limitation concerning the depth of infiltration into the electrode catalyst layer, the infiltration would necessarily be equal to or less than the thickness of the electrode catalyst layer, since it would be impossible for the membrane to infiltrate the electrode catalyst layer further than the thickness of the layer. Additionally, since the MEA of Tsusaka et al. is made by the same method of the instant invention, the infiltration depth would inherently meet this limitation.

It would be desirable to make the platinum catalyst of Koyama et al. in view of Tsusaka et al. 50-250 μm thick, encompassing most of the claimed range, since at smaller thicknesses, there could be an insufficient amount of catalyst, while at larger thicknesses, the catalyst surface could become unstable.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the platinum catalyst of Koyama et al. in view of Tsusaka et al. 50-250 μm thick, since at smaller thicknesses, there could be an insufficient amount of catalyst, while at larger thicknesses, the catalyst surface could become unstable.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed March 15, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that neither Koyama et al. nor Tsusaka et al. teach infiltration of the membrane into the catalyst layer. The examiner disagrees. As is discussed above, in light of the teachings of Kosako et al., the skilled artisan will recognize that the electrolyte layer of Koyama et al. inherently infiltrates the catalyst layer.

Applicant also argues, see page 6 of the Remarks, that Tsusaka et al. do not teach simultaneously forming the electrolyte membrane and bonding the membrane to the catalyst layer. The examiner disagrees. When the method depicted in Figure 1 of Tsusaka et al. is carried out, the membrane is formed because the metalloxane monomer in the electrolyte is polymerized at the point of bonding between the catalyst and membrane in order to serve as a reinforcement to the membrane ([0062]). Thus, the membrane of Tsusaka et al. is not fully formed as the intended membrane prior to the polymerization. Tsusaka et al. clearly teach that the membrane (32b) is bonded to the electrocatalyst layer (14) ([0146]).

Applicant argues that both the catalyst layer and electrolyte membrane of Tsusaka et al. are solid, and the examiner agrees. However, the claims do not preclude either layer from being solid. Applicant also argues that both are polymerized prior to the polymerization, yet as discussed above, the metalloxane is not polymerized to form the intended membrane of Tsusaka et al.

Applicant argues that since only the metalloxane monomer is present in both layers after polymerization, the membrane of Tsusaka et al. does not infiltrate the catalyst layer. The examiner disagrees. Since the metalloxane polymer is a component of the membrane, specifically a reinforcing component of the membrane, it is part of the membrane and it infiltrates the catalyst layer.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alix Elizabeth Echelmeyer whose telephone number is (571)272-1101. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/PATRICK RYAN/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795

Alix Elizabeth Echelmeyer
Examiner
Art Unit 1795

aee